

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

### **Comments re: Notice of Non-Compliant Response:**

This amendment and reply addresses the issues raised in the Notice of Non-Compliant Response dated October 13, 2005, whereby the previously-filed (an unentered) response filed on June 6, 2005, mistakenly did not include the amendments made to claims 1, 8, 10, 11 and 14 in the second preliminary amendment filed on December 29, 2004, as well as to correctly recite the claim language in claim 23 that was added in that previously-filed second preliminary amendment.

### **Status of Claims:**

Claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 14 and 15 are currently being amended.

Claims 6, 9, and 19 are currently being canceled.

Claims 24-26 are currently being added.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, 18 and 20-25 are presently pending for further consideration on the merits.

### **Second Request for Acknowledgement of IDS submitted 12/29/00:**

As stated in the previously filed response, upon review of the application, it was noted that Applicant has not received an initialed copy of the Form 1449 as submitted December 29, 2000, which would acknowledge consideration of the three references cited therein. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner return such initialed copy in the next action.

### **Objection to Claim 9:**

In the Office Action, claim 9 was objected to because it did not further limit the claim from which it depended. By way of this amendment and reply, claim 9 has been canceled, thereby mooted the objection to that claim.

**Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims 2, 15 and 22:**

In the Office Action, claims 2, 15 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because “PHS” was not fully defined in those claims. By way of this amendment and reply, claims 2, 15 and 22 have been amended to provide a full definition for “PHS.”

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a):**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,684,087 to Yu et al. Applicant traverses this rejection for least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a gateway server, in which a convert section judges whether first contents are picture contents, and when the first contents are picture contents, the convert section converts the first contents into second contents. As clearly recited in claim 1, the display performance corresponds to the number of display pixels of the display section of the small terminal so that an image corresponding to the picture contents is sized according to a size of the display section of the small terminal.

Yu et al., on the other hand, divides an image into pieces and transmits each of the pieces separately to a terminal. The terminal of Yu et al. must then combine those pieces in order to display the image at the terminal. Accordingly, Yu et al. does not have a display performance such that an image corresponding to the picture contents is sized according to a size of the display section of the terminal that is receiving the picture contents. That is, Yu et al.’s system does not provide a small terminal with the correct amount of picture contents of an image to be displayed at the small terminal, whereby the small terminal of the present invention does not have to process (e.g., combine information from several pieces of a received image) the received picture contents in order to display them on a display of the small terminal.

Since all of the presently pending claims have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 1, each of the presently pending independent claims is patentable over the disclosure of Yu et al.

**New Claims:**

New claims 24-26 have been added to recite an additional feature of the present invention that is not disclosed or suggested by Yu et al. According to claims 24-26, the image is converted according to the device size of the small terminal and is sent to the small terminal as an undivided image. In Yu et al., on the contrary, the image is not converted in size to thereby provide the image to the small terminal in 'one piece', but rather the image is provided to the small terminal in separate 'pieces' in the system of Yu et al.

**Conclusion:**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 7, 2005

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819